

**REMARKS****I. Introduction**

Claims 1-31 were pending. In the Office Action dated August 26, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-31 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kori (US Patent No. 5,914,754). Applicant notes that the Examiner incorrectly listed claims 1-27 as pending in the Office Action Summary, but correctly acknowledges that claims 1-31 are pending in the Detailed Action.

Applicant hereby requests continued examination. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 24. In light of the arguments and amendments contained herein, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

**II. Claim Rejection – 35 USC §102(b)**

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for fitting a frame of a video feed to a display device that includes:

ascertaining at least one marker defining a region of the frame, the region having a horizontal to vertical ratio matching a horizontal resolution to vertical resolution ratio of the display device;

buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed; and

displaying, on the display device, the region of the frame defined by the at least one marker. (Emphasis Added).

Moreover, although of different scope, claims 9 and 24 recite, in part, "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed" (Emphasis Added). Similarly, although of different scope, claim 12 recites, in

part, "a buffer configured to selectively store rows of the region defined by the at least one marker and exclude rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed" (Emphasis Added). Finally, although of different scope, claim 16 recites, in part, "means for storing in the buffer at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed" (Emphasis Added). None of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest at least these elements of claims 1, 9, 12, 16, and 24.

For example, Kori is directed to a video signal aspect ratio conversion apparatus that stores an entire digital video picture in line memories (col. 5, lines 48-49). Then, "the aspect ratio of the stored digital video picture is converted... by outputting a partial area of the digital video picture from line memories with the desired aspect ratio" (col. 5, lines 52-56) (reference numerals omitted). The result is that Kori crops the video signal in a two step process: 1) storing the entire digital video signal, and 2) outputting only the partial area with the desired aspect ratio. In other words, in contrast to claim 1, Kori crops the entire video signal only after the entire video signal has been stored, and thus fails to disclose "buffering at least one row of the region defined by the at least one marker and excluding rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker such that the rows outside the region defined by the at least one marker are simultaneously cropped from the video feed."

Kori further fails to disclose similar, although patentably distinct, elements in claims 9, 12, 16, and 24. Moreover, claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-15, 17-23, and 25-31 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 9, 12, 16, or 24. For at least these reason, the rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes any fee due has been addressed in the accompanying transmittal charging Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 200309213-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to such deposit account number.

Dated: October 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shelly L. Hokenstad/  
Shelly L. Hokenstad  
Registration No.: 59,107  
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 140  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304  
(248) 594-0636  
Attorney for Applicant